

COMBATING CORRUPTION IN TRANSITION ECONOMIES

ISTANBUL, TURKEY, OCTOBER 7-9 1998

SYNTHESIS REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The OECD, in co-operation with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), convened a regional workshop “Combating Corruption in Transition Economies” on 7-9 October 1998 in Istanbul, Turkey (see [Programme, Annex 1](#)). It was sponsored by the OECD’s Centre for Co-operation with Non-Members (CCNM), the Directorate for Financial, Fiscal, and Enterprise Affairs (DAFFE), the Public Management Service (PUMA), USAID and the Turkish International Co-operation Agency.
2. For two and 1/2 days, approximately 85 people from 20 countries representing Governments, NGOs, international organisations, and the private sector met to discuss ways to improve integrity and transparency in government, combat corruption, and mobilise civil society to join in these efforts.
3. The meeting brought together Government officials and parliamentarians from several Black Sea Economic Co-operation countries (BSEC)¹, OECD and transition economies, as well as representatives of the business community and civil society. In addition, several international organisations, including the Council of Europe, the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the IMF, the World Bank, the United Nations Centre for International Crime Prevention, and the United Nations Development Programme attended. Further, Transparency International and the Soros Foundation Network were among the NGOs represented (see accompanying Participants List, Annex II).
4. The key objectives of the workshop were to: (i) establish a common understanding of the problems in fighting corruption, share anti-corruption experiences, and identify cross-border issues; and initiate pilot monitoring techniques; (ii) obtain country and donor assessment of existing international instruments and anti-corruption programmes, identify needed changes, and develop recommendations and action plans; and (iii) propose, define and launch a regional anti-corruption network of countries and donors.
5. The meeting identified possible actions to be carried out by all actors concerned, namely governments of BSEC Participating Countries, OECD Member Countries, transition economies, the private sector and the civil society, and international organisations and donors.
6. On the public sector side, it was suggested that BSEC and transition economies should proceed with the general reform process which includes increased transparency through establishment of competitive public procurement procedures, improved investment atmosphere through simplification of business licensing procedures, clear administrative sanctions for misuse of power and dissemination of public information related to legislation.

1 The BSEC includes two OECD countries (Greece and Turkey) and nine economies in transition (Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, and Ukraine).

7. On the business and civil society side, it was suggested that there is a strong need for establishing informal public-private partnerships to monitor government activity, for raising public awareness of costs of corruption and for creating anti-bribery pacts among businesses, labour and NGOs.
8. The area of contribution of the donors community was identified as continued support for international controls in procurement and contracting, continued and increased advice related to judicial, civil service and financial systems, continued dialogue on international and regional instruments, and operation of the Anti-Corruption Network launched at the workshop.
9. After opening remarks by the Turkish Minister of Finance, Mr. Zekeriya Temizel, and the President of the Turkish International Co-operation Agency, Ambassador Tugay Ozceri, the workshop was divided into three sessions. In the first, participants reviewed anti-corruption programmes in selected transition economies as illustrative of the general issues involved in combating corruption and discussed international instruments which have been developed in different international fora to support national efforts to combat corruption and other illicit transactions. The second session of discussion groups organised around two main themes: accountability and transparency in the public sector and action by business and civil society. During the third session, participants discussed strategies and actions plans. During the final session, participants identified and discussed measures conducive to a sustained effort to stamp out bribery and corruption.

Session I: Strategies from the Region and International Instruments

10. After a presentation of target areas of intervention in USAID's programme of support to anti-corruption efforts in transition economies, the discussion during Session I centred on anti-corruption strategies in the region and the role of international instruments in supporting national efforts to combat corruption and other illicit transactions. Several themes emerged repeatedly during the course of the session. The principal points were that 1) there is a lack of public awareness of corruption, its costs, and who is doing what in the field; 2) there is a lack of implementation of government anti-corruption plans; and 3) co-ordination of international donor inputs should be strengthened.
11. The first part of the session featured presentations by representatives of Bulgarian and Ukrainian NGOs on the state of anti-corruption work in their respective countries which stimulated a number of questions and comments from the participants. The presentations confirmed that corruption in the region is quite prevalent, that no concrete results have been achieved so far in fighting it, and that civil society is poorly developed.
12. In the Ukraine, the President approved in 1998 an eight-year conceptual policy against corruption. Unfortunately, there appears to be a lack of political will to carry out this fight. Outside of government, journalists say they feel pressure from corrupt local officials if they try to bring to light corrupt activities in *oblasts*, where corruption appears to be higher than at the central government level. NGOs have encountered a lack of understanding and apathy of officials in their attempts to co-operate with state bodies on anti-corruption measures.
13. Furthermore, Ukrainian civil society is poorly developed. There are very few independent NGOs and until 1997 they almost never addressed the issues of studying and counteracting corruption. One such NGO, the Ukrainian Legal Foundation, initiated the "Ukrainian Integrity" programme and has delineated a six-point plan, i.e. involving the public in control over activities of the government to combat corruption;

co-operating with the mass media (with support of the World Bank); undertaking educational activities; organising prevention projects; promoting legislation (to promote transparency and accountability, etc.); and launching a national chapter of Transparency International by November 1998.

14. Bulgaria has not been spared from the global effects of corruption in public life and the economy. Corruption has been exacerbated by short-sighted policies and lack of vision on the part of successive governments. Yet the coalition which came to power in 1997 made combating corruption a priority and put special emphasis on this issue in its policy programme for 1997-2001. In 1998, the Center for the Study of Democracy and other Bulgarian NGOs launched “Coalition 2000”, a pioneering and comprehensive effort to harness the capacity of civil society to establish a public-private partnership against corruption. Coalition 2000 aims to enhance awareness, adoption and practical implementation of democratic values such as transparency, trust and integrity.

15. An “Anti-Corruption Plan for Bulgaria” was drafted for endorsement by a policy forum to be convened in late October 1998. This forum will bring together representatives of several state institutions, NGOs, policy institutes, business associations, regional development agencies, civic groups, international organisations, and local offices of European and American foundations. The Coalition has identified three steps to its campaign: 1) assessing corruption and developing the anti-corruption action plan; 2) conducting an awareness campaign; and 3) monitoring the process. With regard to monitoring, the Coalition, with support of Transparency International, aims to provide, on a quarterly basis, topical information about corruption perceptions and levels of intensity of corrupt practices in different sectors of public life; focus public attention on corruption-related problems by widely disseminating survey results; and exercise pressure on the relevant institutions to implement changes.

16. The presentation of the “Anti-Corruption Plan for Bulgaria” stimulated a number of comments and questions. Indeed, throughout the remainder of the session, speakers hailed Coalition 2000 as an excellent example of a well-structured, comprehensive and inclusive anti-corruption campaign, bringing together actors from all parts of society. A representative of the Council of Europe (CoE) reported that the Council’s Octopus Project has issued “recommendations and guidelines for action” against corruption and organised crime in 16 countries in transition. The most important message of this work is that political will is essential to the successful implementation of anti-corruption plans. One participant said that this information could be of use to NGOs and attention should be given to giving it wider dissemination and publicity. A Ukrainian Government official informed the plenary that the “Centre for Legal Reform and Legislative Drafting,” established three years ago by Presidential Decree within the country’s Ministry of Justice, prepares legislation, including laws against corruption.

17. The second part of the session featured several anti-corruption instruments which have been developed in different international fora to combat bribery and other corrupt activity. Speakers and participants discussed the coverage and gaps of these instruments, and shared views on how they are being – or could be – applied in transition economies. A key point made during the presentation on these instruments is that corruption is not confined to a particular part of the world or to countries at one stage or another of development. Further, it was observed that corruption most affects the world’s poorest, by making people pay for government services to which they may be entitled free of charge (e.g. education, health). Further, major corruption denies the least advantaged opportunities for improved prosperity.

18. Among the examples highlighted was the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions, adopted in December 1997. The Convention sets forth a standard for effective national laws to criminalise bribery of foreign public officials in international business transactions and a basis for effective international judicial co-operation. Another

instrument cited was the IMF Guidance Note of August 1997. This policy paper called for “a more proactive approach in advocating policies and the development of institutions and administrative systems that eliminate the opportunity for bribery, corruption, and fraudulent activity in the management of public resources.”

19. Other regional actions which were reported include the November 1997 resolution of the Committee of European Ministers of Justice and the May 1997 EU Convention on the Fight Against Corruption Involving Officials of the European Communities or Officials of EU Member States. The European Ministers of Justice resolution calls upon the Multidisciplinary Group on Corruption (GMC) to draft text proposing the establishment of a mechanism under the auspices of the Council of Europe for monitoring observance of 20 “Guiding Principles” for the fight against corruption, and the implementation of international legal instruments against corruption. The EU convention forms part of the *acquis communautaire* (body of legislation), and will have to be applied by new entrants into the Union. Also in May 1997, the European Commission adopted a policy paper on a “Union Policy Against Corruption,” and in June 1997 the European Council, meeting in Amsterdam, adopted an “Action Plan to Combat Organised Crime.”

20. Another regional action which was reported was the implementation of the Council of Europe’s Programme of Action against Corruption. Participants were informed about the following international instruments against corruption which are now on the “drawing table” of the Council of Europe in the criminal, administrative and civil law fields: The Criminal Law Convention on Corruption, opened for signature as from 4 November 1998, and which aims at aligning national legislation concerning certain corruption offences and at improving international co-operation for the prosecution of such offences; the European Model Code of Conduct for Public Officials, which should be adopted by the Committee of Ministers in the first half of next year; and the International Instrument on civil remedies for compensation for damage resulting from acts of corruption. It is foreseen that this Convention will be adopted by the Committee of Ministers in 1999.

21. Representatives of both the industry and the trade union associations advising the OECD advocated the establishment of a system to monitor compliance with instruments, and to raise the profile of the anti-corruption struggle. Other interventions highlighted areas that are identified as insufficiently covered by international instruments; these include foreign aid and basic human rights. In addition, it was observed that NGOs can perform a vital role by putting pressure on governments to take action against corruption in compliance with international instruments.

Session II: Focus Group Discussions

22. To provide participants with the opportunity to explore certain topics in greater detail, the workshop split into two parallel focus groups on the afternoon of the first day. One group addressed accountability and transparency in the public sector, while the other deliberated action that could be taken by business and civil society. The time of the former group was evenly divided between, on the one hand, issues related to public procurement, audit and accounting, and, on the other, judicial strengthening and law enforcement activities.

23. In the focus group on accountability and transparency, presentations by the head of the Hungarian supreme audit institution and the head of the Polish public procurement office reinforced the point that by striving to ensure good governance and the proper use of public funds, governments can also check corruption. Basic principles underlying a professional public procurement system were identified

as: open competition, transparency, written documentation and the right to appeal. By widely disseminating information, the Polish public procurement office has increased opportunities for enterprises interested in selling goods and services to the government, stimulated greater competition, and lowered prices paid with public monies (while retaining quality). It is estimated that this modern public procurement system, launched with an act approved in 1994, has resulted in cost savings of 10-15 percent annually.

24. The presentation on Hungary's supreme audit institution (SAI) revealed that, as in other countries, this independent body controls the legality, regularity and effectiveness of public spending. During its decade of operation, the Hungarian SAI has identified many breaches of laws and regulations, mismanagement, and ill-considered decisions. It is believed that lack of expertise, unclear legislation, carelessness and pre-meditated motives (including interest in personal financial gain), have contributed to such breaches. The share of the shadow economy in Hungary is estimated at between 28 percent and 33 percent.

25. It was noted that accountants (and auditors and analysts) can act in a number of ways to contribute to the anti-corruption effort. Internally, they can provide a record, establish accountability, design control systems, analyse performance, monitor projects, report results and highlight problems. Externally, they can provide independent assurance, design control systems, highlight problems, exert ethical influence, report to outside parties and provide business leadership. To be effective, these specialists require an anti-corruption framework, comprising laws, enforcement and regulators; professionalism, supported by standards, ethics and training; organisational governance, including an appropriate management attitude and board oversight; and an adequate education system.

26. The concept of an "ethics infrastructure" was also discussed during this part of the programme. Participants were briefed on the "Recommendation on Improving Ethical Conduct in the Public Service," approved by the OECD Council in April 1998. The recommendation serves to guide OECD governments in creating this infrastructure, which consists of a number of elements supporting high standards of behaviour in the public service. It was explained that to promote ethical conduct in the administration, governments need to develop and regularly review policies, procedures and institutions related to ethical conduct in the public service. Further, they must incorporate the ethical dimension into management frameworks to ensure that management practices are consistent with the values and principles of the public service.

27. The second half of the focus group discussed Russia's efforts to promote an independent judiciary by improving the selection and qualification of judges. Discussions highlighted the need for independent judges, and the selection of candidates on criteria based on professionalism and competence. The importance of giving due attention to working conditions, adequate financing and remuneration, and protection for judges was also noted. Further, it was remarked that judges should be involved in the selection and promotion of fellow judges. Council of Europe actions to support law enforcement and the judiciary in transition countries also were reviewed.

28. The second focus group brought attention to the large role that civil society can play in changing incentives which promote the abuse of power in the public sector. A case study of a Georgian NGO active in the anti-corruption movement helped to illustrate the challenges confronted in promoting public sector reform in NIS countries. Participants in this group explored the emergence of corruption in cases where public officials seek rents from the private sector in exchange for special economic privileges or monopoly powers, a practice which distorts investment and resource allocation decisions.

29. Participants mentioned numerous obstacles to curbing corrupt behaviour, including over-centralised government, excessive regulations, and a lack of transparency. It was noted that in Azerbaijan, for example, corruption has penetrated everywhere. There is no proper audit of government work, no civil service law, no asset declaration requirements, no freedom of information law and little pay for those working in the administration. Focus group participants warmly embraced the idea of an informal regional anti-corruption network, as long as it did not duplicate the work of other institutions and structures.

Session III: Developing Strategies and Action Plans

30. Participants reconvened for the plenary and received rapporteur reports on outcomes of the two focus groups. In addition, a presentation was made on the World Bank's use of empirical surveys to support anti-corruption efforts. Over the past year, the World Bank has helped various transition economies to measure corruption and design strategies to combat it and to improve governance. The Bank and interested countries are using empirical surveys to inform -- and transform -- the policy dialogue, so that a workable anti-corruption agenda can be established.

31. Most of the session was dedicated to four country case studies – Albania, Georgia, Latvia and Russia – presented by persons familiar with the situation in each country. Problem areas were identified and ways of dealing with them were explored. A panel commented on the countries' strategies, and, together with participants, explored particular issues while offering examples from other countries' experiences.

32. In 1997, USAID, the World Bank and the Soros Foundation undertook an anti-corruption project in Albania involving surveys on corruption among public officials and enterprises, and the preparation of anti-corruption schemes. The survey outcomes and a series of governmental measures proposed to curb corruption were made known at a national conference in June 1998. Through these surveys, the public and businesses indicated their perceptions that corruption is particularly serious in the judiciary, customs and tax agencies, public services (including hospitals), public procurement, and hiring in the public service. Among the positive results recorded since the conference have been the extensive media coverage and more open discussion of corruption, a focusing citizen attention on the most corrupted institutions, disappearance of immunity of officials from criticism for corrupt behaviour, and increased understanding that corruption damages the common future of all Albanians. On the other hand, the debate over corruption remains extremely politicised, unrealistically short deadlines for ending corruption have been announced, and neither individuals nor involved institutions are sufficiently involved in the anti-corruption movement. To strengthen the position of civil society, the legal framework and fund-raising capabilities for NGOs should be improved, investigative journalism further developed, NGO staff better trained, and networking among NGOs enhanced.

33. In Georgia, President Shevardnadze requested in 1997 World Bank advice and assistance in formulating an anti-corruption strategy for Georgia. The Bank assisted the Government in hosting an initial workshop (in June 1998) to identify major areas in which corruption was having a damaging impact on the public sector. In addition, with support of USAID, surveys were conducted to assess perceptions of corruption by businesses, households and public employees and public officials. The surveys showed that the general public was greatly concerned about corruption and perceived that the traffic police, ordinary police, customs and tax authorities were the most dishonest. Businesses expressed the view that they were heavily burdened by governmental corruption and excessive regulations, and public officials acknowledge that a system of bribery and corruption exists, due in part to the low pay for civil servants.

34. In Latvia, surveys have also reflected a public perception that corruption is a major problem. The Government set up a Corruption Prevention Council in 1997, headed by the Minister of Justice. Like in Albania and Georgia, a donor-supported conference (held in 1997) gave momentum to the anti-corruption drive. A programme has been outlined through the year 2000 and is updated every six months. Government officials have been sacked for alleged corruption, but there have been few if any prosecutions. Civil servants can hold jobs that create conflicts of interest.

35. In Russia, the Government is said to be losing 30 per cent of its revenue due to corruption. Several anti-corruption laws and secondary legislation have been adopted, but there is insufficient state commitment and civil support to implementation. A decree issued in 1997 requires civil servants (but not parliamentarians) to declare their assets. A new criminal code which entered into effect the same year includes a number of anti-corruption provisions; participants noted, however, that many widespread corrupt practices were not covered by the law.

36. Participants volunteered a number of ideas during the discussion of these different country case studies. The ombudsman institution was described as a useful component of an anti-corruption strategy, but not necessarily helpful where corruption is systemic; it was observed that an ombudsman cannot replace the rule of law. Once again, it was noted that non-governmental organisations need to be involved, that coalitions involving both governments and NGOs should be forged, and that donors play an important role (by serving as catalyst, providing financing, and offering technical support).

37. It was noted that foreign support to NGOs must be managed carefully as in some countries this evokes criticism and allegations of foreign interference in domestic affairs. Some NGOs highlighted their work with youth, emphasising the importance of reaching individuals before they have accepted corruption as a simple fact of life. Donor support should take into account the difficulty of launching NGOs outside capitals. Foreign assistance should be transparent, take into account local circumstances, and not be only short-term in nature. Information about possibilities for donor support should be made more widely available.

38. The transition countries offered several recommendations to donors on the roles they can play to best support the anti-corruption programs of host countries. Stable, long-term assistance is preferred over short-term aid. Donor assistance should be focused on developing the institutional capacity and expertise of government, NGOs and the private sector to fight corruption. Assistance should be provided in the country's local language. Programs should be donor-sponsored, not donor-driven. Finally, donors should attempt to implement their programs through local partners, as opposed to importing outside experts.

Closing

39. During the final session, participants identified and discussed measures conducive for strengthening institutions against corrupt incentives. The participants considered specific initiatives to be undertaken by governments, the private sector and international organisations. In addition participants discussed possible follow-up activities and agreed to launch an informal, regional Anti-Corruption Network.

40. Workshop participants recognised that corruption is caused by weak institutions:

- lack of enforcement, monitoring and political advocacy;
- lack of separation between public/private activity;
- lack of judicial independence and strong separation of powers.

41. Participants also recognised that corruption threatens democratic institutions, political stability and favourable business and investment climate, and that civil society (media, NGOs, business, labour, consumers' groups) must play "watchdog" role and create public-private partnerships to monitor government behaviour.

42. The following recommendations emerged from the plenary discussion and the Chairman's conclusions:

Governments of transition economies

Governments of transition economies are encouraged to further combat corruption by undertaking the following actions:

- increase transparency through the establishment of competitive public procurement procedures;
- improve the investment climate through the simplification of business licensing procedures;
- enforce Codes of Ethics by clear administrative sanctions for misuse of power;
- adopt "Freedom of Information" laws, disseminate public information about legislation, and establish open appeals processes;
- establish parliamentary or independent audit and investigative functions and strengthen them through training.

Private sector and civil society

- informal public-private partnerships should be established to monitor government activity and liaise with the donor community;
- public awareness of the costs of corruption should be raised and efforts made to "lobby" government to address its root causes; and
- "islands of integrity" and anti-bribery pacts should be formed among business, trade unions and NGOs.

International organisations and donors community

Given the importance of corruption in the region, the role of international organisations and the donors community in combating it is crucial. Areas identified for action by international donors included:

- continued technical assistance where country resources and skills are insufficient (but not as a substitute for in-country expertise or political will);
- support for international controls in public procurement and contracting;
- enhanced institutional development programmes and advice in areas such as the judiciary, civil service and financial systems;
- utilisation of international and regional instruments; and
- operation of the Anti-Corruption Network launched at the workshop.

Follow-up activities

43. The principal outcome of the workshop was the decision by the delegates from transition economies of the former Soviet Union and of the Black Sea Economic Co-operation, joined by OECD Member countries and international organisations, to launch an Informal Anti-Corruption Network under the leadership of the OECD to help co-ordinate national and international programmes to combat corruption in the region.

44. The key objectives of the Informal Anti-Corruption Network are to:

- help co-ordinate public/private sector, regional, extra-regional, and country/donor programs as well as promote partnership by exchanging information and experiences as well as seeking collaboration on past, current, and planned programs;
- provide a forum for discussing of specific topics including government procurement and public auditing and strengthening the judiciary, economic reform and international co-operation;
- review progress of national and international anti-corruption programme methods;
- contribute to the formulation, implementation and review of national anti-corruption programmes and methods.

45. A Steering Group consisting of international organisations and major NGOs (in particular the Soros Foundation and Transparency International) will be set up to encourage participation by Network members and to identify Group representatives in each participating country and among international organisations. The Steering Group will meet in the first quarter of 1999 to approve the terms of reference and to launch a concrete action programme. The OECD, in co-operation with other donors, will act as the Secretariat of the Network.

WORKSHOP ON COMBATING CORRUPTION IN TRANSITION ECONOMIES
Istanbul, Turkey, 7-9 October 1998

PROGRAMME

DAY ONE

WEDNESDAY, 7 October 1998

8:30 - 9:00 **Registration**
Participants receive basic orientation and documentation including copies of presentations and lists of participants.

OPENING

9:00 - 9:15 **Welcoming Remarks**
H.E. Zekeriya Temizel, Minister of Finance of the Republic of Turkey
H.E. Tugay Ozçeri, President of the Turkish International Co-operation Agency

9:15 - 9:30 **Introductory Remarks**
Mr. Rainer Geiger, Deputy Director; Directorate for Financial, Fiscal and Enterprise Affairs, OECD

SESSION I	STRATEGIES FROM THE REGION AND INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS
------------------	---

9:30 - 10:30 **A. Country Strategies**

Chairs: *Mr. Corbin Lyday, Senior Advisor, Anti-Corruption Working Group, USAID*

Lead speakers:

Mr. Nikolay Poludionny, Director, Ukrainian Legal Foundation, Ukraine

Mr. Boiko Todorov, Programme Director, Centre for the Study of Democracy, Coalition 2000, Bulgaria

General discussion

10:30 - 10:45 **Coffee break**

10:45 -13:00 **B. Global and Regional Instruments**

Chair: *Mr. Rainer Geiger*, Deputy Director; Directorate for Financial, Fiscal and Enterprise Affairs, OECD

Lead speaker:

Mr. Dieter Biallas, Senior Advisor, Transparency International

Panel:

Mr. Zef Preci, Director, Albanian Centre for Economic Research

Mrs. Vira Naniyska, Director, International Centre for Policy Studies, Ukraine

Mr. Charles Kovacs, Business Industrial Advisory Group to the OECD (BIAC)

12:00 - 13:00 *General Discussion*

13:00 - 14:30 ***Lunch***

SESSION II	FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS
-------------------	--------------------------------

14:30 - 18:00 ***Accountability and Transparency in the Public Sector***

1: Public Procurement, Audit, and Accounting Systems

Moderator: *Mr. Bart Edes*, Principal Administrator, SIGMA Programme, OECD

Discussants:

Mr. Marian Lemke, Chairman, Public Procurement Office, Poland

Mr. Arpad Kovacs, President, Supreme Audit Institution, Hungary

Mr. John Flaherty, Anti-Corruption Task Force, International Federation of Accountants (IFAC)

2: Judicial Strengthening and Law Enforcement Activities

Moderator: *Mrs. Cayetana de Zulueta*, Senator, Italy and Vice Chairwoman of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly

Discussants:

Mr. Justice Anatoliy Vasilevich Zhrebtsov, Chairman, Supreme Qualifying Collegium of Judges of the Russian Federation

Mrs. Katerina Pistor, Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Private Law

Mr. Jumabay Shamshiyev, Chief Expert, National Security Council

Mr. Ludovic Aigrot, Programme Officer, Octopus Project, Directorate of Legal Affairs, Council of Europe

General discussion

14:30-18:00 **Action by Business and Civil Society**

Moderator: *Mr. Boiko Todorov*, Programme Director, Centre for the Study of Democracy, Coalition 2000, Bulgaria

Discussants:

Mr. Charles Kovacs, Business Industrial Advisory Group to the OECD (BIAC)

Mrs. Jean Rogers, Director, CIPE, Hungary

Mr. Roy Jones, Counselor, Trade Union Advisory Committee to the OECD (TUAC)

Mr. George Bukeria, Director, Liberty Institute, Georgia

General discussion

16:15 -16:30 **Coffee break**

18:30 **RECEPTION HOTEL PERA PALAS**

Hosted by the Turkish Government

DAY TWO

THURSDAY, 8 October 1998

SESSION III	DEVELOPING STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS
-------------	--

PLENARY *Participants of both focus groups regroup together*

9:00 - 9:45 **Focus Group Presentations:** *rapporteurs selected during the previous day's sessions will present to the plenary the actions and recommendations they have devised.*

9:45 - 13:00 **Country Strategy Review: Albania, Latvia and Georgia**

9:45- 10:30 **Moderator:** *Ms. Madalene O'Donnell*, World Bank Resident Mission, Albania

Mr. Zef Preci, Director, Albanian Centre for Economic research

Mrs. Zane Zeibote, OECD Consultant

Mr. Badri Abzianidze, Acting Chairman, Anti-Corruption Committee of Parliament, Georgia

10:30 - 11:15 **Panel:**

Mr. Dieter Biallas, Executive Director, Transparency International

Mr. Oleksey Stupnitsky, Private Initiatives Foundation, Ukraine

Mr. Charles Kovacs, Business Industrial Advisory Group to the OECD (BIAC)

11:15 - 11:30 *Coffee break*

11:30 - 13:00 *General discussion*

13:00 - 14:30 *Lunch*

14:30 - 16:45 **Country Strategy Review: Russia**

Moderator: *Ms. Madalene O'Donnell*, World Bank Resident Mission, Albania

14:30 - 15:00 **Lead Speaker:** *Ms. Elena Glebova*, General Procurator's Office, Russia

15:00 -16:00 **Panel:**

Mr. Valery Ponomarev, Consultant, World Bank, Russia

Ms. Beth Jones, Project Co-ordinator, UN Center for International Crime Prevention

Mr. Dieter Biallas, Executive Director, Transparency International

Mr. Charles Kovacs, Business Industrial Advisory Group to the OECD (BIAC)

16:00-16:45 Conclusions

PARTICIPANT WORKING SESSION

16:45 - 18:30 *Country delegations meet with other participants to discuss follow-up and individual action plans*

DAY THREE

FRIDAY, 9 October 1998

CLOSING

CONCLUSIONS AND FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

PLENARY

9:00 - 10:30 **Chair:** *Mr. Rainer Geiger*, Deputy Director, Directorate for Financial, Fiscal, and Enterprise Affairs, OECD

Panel: Representatives of the Country Panels and rapporteurs from the last day's working group session

Advisory Group discussion

10:30 - 11:00 *Coffee break*

11:00 - 12:00 **Chairman's Conclusions**

12:00 **Meeting Adjourns**